arXiv:1106.2260v1 [math.PR] 11 Jun 2011

On the Bahadur – Kiefer Representation for Intermediate Sample Quantiles

Nadezhda Gribkova*[1] and Roelof Helmers[2]

[1] *St.Petersburg State University, Mathematics and Mechanics Faculty,*
198504, St.Petersburg, Stary Peterhof, Universitetsky pr. 28, Russia
E-mail: nv.gribkova@gmail.com
[2] *Center for Mathematics and Computer Science*
P.O.Box 94079, 1090 GB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail: helmers@cwi.nl

Abstract

We investigate a Bahadur-Kiefer type representation for the p_n-th empirical quantile corresponding to a sample of n i.i.d. random variables, when $p_n \in (0,1)$ is a sequence which, in particular, may tend to 0 or 1, i.e. we consider the case of intermediate sample quantiles. We obtain an 'in probability' version of the Bahadur – Kiefer type representation for a k_n-th order statistic when $r_n = k_n \wedge (n-k_n) \to \infty$ under some mild regularity conditions, and an 'almost sure' version under additional assumption that $\log n/r_n \to 0$, $n \to \infty$. A representation for the sum of order statistics laying between the population p_n-quantile and the corresponding empirical quantile is also established.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 62E20, 62G30, 62G32.

Key words and phrases: Bahadur – Kiefer type representation, Bahadur – Kiefer processes, empirical processes, quantile processes, U-statistic approximation.

1 Introduction

The classical Bahadur – Kiefer representation was established by Bahadur [1] and Kiefer [13]-[15], it allows one to replace the quantile process by (-1) times the empirical process with an almost sure uniform error of the order $n^{-1/4+o(1)}$, where n is the real i.i.d. data sample size (see, e.g., Shorack and Wellner [19], Deheuvels and Mason [6], Deheuvels [4], see also references therein).

In this paper we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the so-called intermediate sample quantile, i.e. of the k_n-th order statistic, $1 \le k_n \le n$, when $r_n := k_n \wedge (n - k_n) \to \infty$, $p_n := k_n/n \to 0$ (or $p_n \to 1$), as $n \to \infty$. We obtain Bahadur–Kiefer type representations for intermediate sample quantiles under a mild regularity condition, and we establish also a representation for sum of the order statistics laying between the population p_n-th quantile and the corresponding sample quantile.

Consider a sequence $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ of independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) real-valued random variables (r.v.) with common distribution function (df) F, and for each integer $n \geq 1$ let $X_{1:n} \leq \cdots \leq X_{n:n}$ denote the order statistics based on the sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Let $F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}$, $0 < u \leq 1$, $F^{-1}(0) = F^{-1}(0^+)$, denote the left-continuous inverse function of *df* F, and F_n, F_n^{-1} — the empirical *df* and its inverse respectively, put $f = F'$ to be a density of the underlying distribution when it exists. Let $\xi_p = F^{-1}(p)$, $\xi_{p\,n:n} = F_n^{-1}(p)$ denote p-th population and sample quantile respectively.

For a fixed $p \in (0,1)$ assuming that F has at least two continuous derivatives in a neighborhood of ξ_p and $f(\xi_p) > 0$, Bahadur [1] first establish the almost sure result:

$$\xi_{p\,n:n} = \xi_p - \frac{F_n(\xi_p) - p}{f(\xi_p)} + R_n(p), \tag{1.1}$$

where $R_n(p) = O_{\text{a.s.}}\left(n^{-3/4}(\log n)^{1/2}(\log\log n)^{1/4}\right)$ (a sequence of random variables R_n is said to be $O_{\text{a.s.}}(\tau_n)$ if R_n/τ_n is almost surely bounded). Kiefer in a sequence of papers [13]-[15] proved that if f' is bounded in a neighborhood of p and $f(\xi_p) > 0$, then $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \pm n^{3/4}(\log\log n)^{-3/4} R_n(p) = \frac{2^{5/4}3^{-3/4}(p(1-p))^{1/4}}{f(\xi_p)}$ *a.s.* for either choice of sign. In Reiss [17] a version of Bahadur's result with a remainder term, which is of the order $O(\log n/n)^{3/4}$ in probability was obtained: if the density $f = F'$ is Lipschitz in a neighborhood of p and $f(\xi_p) > 0$, then (1.1) holds true and $\boldsymbol{P}\left(|R_n(p)| > A(\log n/n)^{3/4}\right) \leq Bn^{-c}$ for every $c > 0$, where A, B are some positive constants, not depending on n.

Our interest in Bahadur-Kiefer type representation for intermediate empirical quantile was first motivated by its uses in the second order asymptotic analysis of trimmed sums. It turns out (see Gribkova and Helmers [7]-[9]) that the Bahadur – Kiefer properties provide a very useful tool in investigation of the asymptotic behavior of the distributions of trimmed sums of i.i.d. r.v.'s, slightly trimmed sums and their studentized versions. In particular, the Bahadur's representation allows us to construct a U-statistics type stochastic approximation for these statistics, which will enable us to establish the Berry – Esseen type bounds and the Edgeworth expansions in Central Limit Theorems for normalized and studentized slightly trimmed sums.

We would like to emphasize, that the Bahadur-Kiefer type representation we obtain for a sum of order statistics lying between the p_n-th population quantile and the corresponding empirical quantile (cf. Theorem 2.2), is especially useful in the construction of the U-statistic type approximation for a (slightly) trimmed sum, as it provides a quadratic term of the desired U-statistic. Note also that formally the representation (2.7) (cf. Theorem 2.2) can be obtained by integrating of the corresponding Bahadur – Kiefer process in interval $[\xi_{p_n n:n}, \xi_{p_n})$, however we prove representation (2.7) for intermediate order statistics (i.e. when $p_n \to 0$ (or $p_n \to 1$). The remainder terms in our representations are shown to be of a suitable order of magnitude similar as in Reiss [17].

Part of our results can be compared with an earlier result obtained by Chanda [3], who established the Bahadur – Kiefer representation for the intermediate k_n-th order statistics, assuming the somewhat restrictive condition $n^a/k_n \to 0$ for some $a > 0$ and, in addition, some strong regularity conditions on F must be satisfied.

We conclude this introduction by noting that some extensions of Bahadur's result to dependent random variables have been proved by Sen [18] (cf. also Wu [21]). The validity of Bahadur's representation for a bootstrapped p-quantile was proved (as an auxiliary result) in Gribkova and Helmers [8]. Deheuvels [5] established a multivariate Bahadur–Kiefer representation for the empirical copula process.

2 Statement of results

Let k_n be a sequences of integers, such that $0 \le k_n \le n$, and $r_n = k_n \wedge (1 - k_n) \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$. Put $p_n = k_n/n$, and let $\xi_{p_n} = F^{-1}(p_n)$, $\xi_{p_n\, n:n} = F_n^{-1}(p_n)$ denote p_n-th population and empirical quantile respectively.

Define two numbers

$$0 \le a_1 = \liminf_{n\to\infty} p_n \quad \le \quad a_2 = \limsup_{n\to\infty} p_n \le 1. \tag{2.1}$$

We will assume throughout this note that the following smoothness condition is satisfied.

$[A_1]$. *The function* F^{-1} *is differentiable in some open set* $U \subset (0,1)$ *(i.e. the density* $f = F'$ *exists and is positive in* $F^{-1}(U)$*), moreover*

$$U \supset \begin{array}{ll} (0,\varepsilon), & \textit{if}\;\; 0 = a_1 = a_2, \\ (0,a_2] & \textit{if}\;\; 0 = a_1 < a_2, \\ [a_1,a_2], & \textit{if}\;\; 0 < a_1 \le a_2 < 1, \end{array} \qquad U \supset \begin{array}{ll} (1-\varepsilon,1), & \textit{if}\;\; a_1 = a_2 = 1, \\ [a_1,1), & \textit{if}\;\; 0 < a_1 < a_2 = 1, \\ (0,1), & \textit{if}\;\; a_1 = 0,\; a_2 = 1, \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

with some $0 < \varepsilon \le 1$ *in cases given in the first lines of* (2.2)*).*

To state our results we will need also the following condition:

$[A_2]$. $$r_n^{-1} \log n \to 0, \qquad n \to \infty.$$

Let h be a real-valued function defined on the set $F^{-1}(U)$ (cf. (2.2)). Take an arbitrary $0 < C < \infty$ and for all sufficiently large n define

$$\Psi_{p_n,h}(C) = \sup_{|t|\le C} \left| h \circ F^{-1}\Big(p_n + t\sqrt{\frac{r_n \log r_n}{n^2}}\Big) - h \circ F^{-1}\Big(p_n\Big) \right|, \tag{2.3}$$

where $h \circ F^{-1}(u) = h\big(F^{-1}(u)\big)$. Note that $p_n + t\sqrt{\frac{r_n \log r_n}{n^2}} = p_n + t\,\frac{r_n}{n}\,\sqrt{\frac{\log r_n}{r_n}} = p_n + t\,\frac{r_n}{n}\,o(1)$, $n \to \infty$. In particular, this implies that the function introduced in (2.3) is well-defined for all sufficiently large n.

Next we define a function $\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,h}(C)$ which is equal to $\Psi_{p_n,h}(C)$, where $\log r_n$ is replaced by $\log n$. Similarly as before we show that it is well-defined for all sufficiently large n if condition $[A_2]$ holds true.

We will obtain the Bahadur-Kiefer type representations for some smooth function of the empirical quantile, as it turned out (cf. [7]-[9]) that these extensions are very useful in construction of the U-statistic type stochastic approximations for the trimmed sums.

Let $G(x)$, $x \in R$, be a real-valued function, $g = G'$ – its derivative when it exists, and let $(g/f)(x)$ and $(|g|/f)(x)$ denote the ratios $g(x)/f(x)$ and $|g(x)|/f(x)$ respectively.

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose that* $r_n \to \infty$*, as* $n \to \infty$*, the condition* $[A_1]$ *holds true and* G *is differentiable on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$*. Then*

$$G(\xi_{p_n n:n}) - G(\xi_{p_n}) = -[F_n(\xi_{p_n}) - F(\xi_{p_n})]\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + R_n(p_n), \tag{2.4}$$

where for each $c > 0$

$$\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > \Delta_n) = O\left(r_n^{-c}\right), \tag{2.5}$$

with

$$\Delta_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{1/4}\left(\frac{\log r_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + B\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{1/2}\left(\frac{\log r_n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C),$$

where A*,* B *and* C *are some positive constants, which depend only on* c*.*

Moreover, if additionally the condition $[A_2]$ *is also satisfied, then* (2.4) *holds true and*

$$\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > \widehat{\Delta}_n) = O\left(n^{-c}\right), \tag{2.6}$$

for each $c > 0$ *with*

$$\widehat{\Delta}_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{1/4}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + B\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{1/2}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C),$$

where A*,* B *and* C *are some positive constants, which depend only on* c*.*

Theorem 2.1 is a Bahadur-Kiefer type result. For the special case when $0 < p < 1$ is fixed it is stated in Lemma 3.1 of [7] (cf. also Lemma 4.1, [8] and Reiss [17]).

Remark 2.1 *It is easy to see that if one compares the first term on the r.h.s. of* (2.4) *and the orders of magnitude of the quantities* Δ_n*,* $\widehat{\Delta}_n$ *given in* (2.5)—(2.6) *that relation* (2.4) *provides a representation with a remainder term* $R_n(p_n)$ *of smaller order than the first term if and only if* $\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C) = o\big(\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\big)$ *and* $\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C) = o\big(\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\big)$ *for every fixed* $C > 0$*, as* $n \to \infty$*. The same remark is valid for the two assertions stated in Theorem 2.2 below.*

We relegate proofs of our results to sections 3 – 4.

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that* $r_n \to \infty$*, as* $n \to \infty$*, the condition* $[A_1]$ *holds true and* G *is differentiable on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$*. Then*

$$\int_{\xi_{p_n n:n}}^{\xi_{p_n}} (G(x) - G(\xi_{p_n}))\,dF_n(x) = -\frac{1}{2}[F_n(\xi_{p_n}) - F(\xi_{p_n})]^2\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + R_n(p_n), \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > \Delta_n) = O\left(r_n^{-c}\right), \tag{2.8}$$

for each $c > 0$ *with*

$$\Delta_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{3/4}\left(\frac{\log r_n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + B\,p_n(1-p_n)\frac{\log r_n}{n}\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C),$$

where A*,* B *and* C *are some positive constants, which depend only on* c*.*

Moreover, if additionally the condition $[A_2]$ *is also satisfied, then* (2.4) *holds true, and*

$$\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > \widehat{\Delta}_n) = O\left(n^{-c}\right) \tag{2.9}$$

for each $c > 0$ *with*

$$\widehat{\Delta}_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{3/4}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + B\,p_n(1-p_n)\frac{\log n}{n}\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C),$$

where A*,* B *and* C *are some positive constants, which depend only on* c*.*

Theorem 2.2 extends Lemma 4.3 from [8] (cf. also Lemma 3.2, [7]), where it was proved for a fixed p to the case that p_n is a sequence which may tend to 0 or to 1. Note also that if both conditions $[A_1]$ and $[A_2]$ are satisfied, then Theorems 2.1—2.2 and an application of the Borel-Cantelly lemma imply an almost sure result, i.e. $R_n(p_n) = O_{a.s.}(\widehat{\Delta}_n)$, as $n \to \infty$.

Next we will state some consequences of the Theorems 2.1—2.2 where the remainder terms are given in simpler form. Our first two consequences concern the Bahadur-Kiefer type representations for the central (not intermediate) order statistics.

Corollary 2.1 *Suppose that* $0 < a_1 \le a_2 < 1$, *the condition* $[A_1]$ *holds true and the functions* $f = F'$ *and* $g = G'$ *satisfies a Hölder condition of the order* $\alpha \ge 1/2$ *on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$. *Then* (2.4) *is valid and* $\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > A(\log n/n)^{3/4}) = O\left(n^{-c}\right)$ *for each* $c > 0$, *where* $A > 0$ *is some constant, not depending on* n.

Corollary 2.2 *Suppose that the conditions of the Corollary 2.1 are satisfied. Then* (2.7) *is valid and* $\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > A(\log n/n)^{5/4}) = O\left(n^{-c}\right)$ *for each* $c > 0$, *where* $A > 0$ *is some constant, not depending on* n.

To prove Corollaries 2.1—2.2 it suffices to note that the condition $0 < a_1 \le a_2 < 1$ implies that $[A_2]$ is automatically satisfied, moreover, due to condition $[A_1]$ the density f is bounded away from zero on the set $F^{-1}([a_1 - \delta,\, a_2 + \delta])$ with some $\delta > 0$, and hence, the ratio g/f satisfies a Hölder condition of the order $\alpha \ge 1/2$ on this set. Then an application of Hölder's condition to the function $\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C)$ (cf. (2.3)) proves both corollaries.

Next we state several corollaries for the intermediate sample quantiles provided some regularity conditions are satisfied.

Note that the second terms of Δ_n and $\widehat{\Delta}_n$ in (2.5)-(2.6) and in (2.8)-(2.9), involving the functions $\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C)$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C)$, depend on the asymptotic properties of the ratio g/f, and we can describe some sets of conditions allowing to absorb these second terms in the first ones. We will need the following conditions:

$$(i)\ \Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C) = O\left(\left(\frac{\log r_n}{r_n}\right)^{1/4} \frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\right); \quad (ii)\ \widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C) = O\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{r_n}\right)^{1/4} \frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\right). \tag{2.10}$$

We preface a formulation of the corollaries of Theorems 2.1—2.2 with a stating of two its direct consequence under conditions (2.10).

Theorem 2.3 *Suppose that* $r_n \to \infty$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *the condition* $[A_1]$ *holds true and* G *is differentiable on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$. *Assume in the addition that the condition* (i) *in* (2.10) *holds true. Then the representation* (2.4) *and the relation* (2.5) *are valid together with* $\Delta_n = A\left(p_n(1-p_n)\right)^{1/4}\left(\frac{\log r_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$, *where* A *is some positive constant not depending on* n.

Moreover, if additionally the condition $[A_2]$ *and relation* (ii) *in* (2.10) *are satisfied, then* (2.4) *and* (2.6) *are valid with* $\widehat{\Delta}_n = A\left(p_n(1-p_n)\right)^{1/4}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$.

Theorem 2.4 *Suppose that* $r_n \to \infty$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *the condition* $[A_1]$ *holds true and* G *is differentiable on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$. *Assume in the addition that the condition* (i) *in* (2.10) *holds true. Then the representation* (2.7) *and the relation* (2.8) *are valid together* *with* $\Delta_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{3/4}\left(\frac{\log r_n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$, *where* A *is some positive constant not depending on* n*.*

Moreover, if additionally the condition $[A_2]$ *and the relation* (ii) *in* (2.10) *are satisfied, then* (2.7) *and* (2.9) *are valid with* $\widehat{\Delta}_n = A\,(p_n(1-p_n))^{3/4}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$*.*

Now we expose certain sets of conditions sufficient for the relations (2.10) and obtain some corollaries of Theorems 2.3—2.4.

Let $SRV_\rho^{+\infty}$ $(SRV_\rho^{-\infty})$ be a class of regularly varying in $+\infty$ $(-\infty)$ functions: $g \in SRV_\rho^{+\infty}$ $(SRV_\rho^{-\infty}) \Leftrightarrow$ (i) $g(x) = \pm|x|^\rho\,L(x)$, for $|x| > x_0$, with some $x_0 > 0$ $(x_0 < 0)$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, and $L(x)$ is a positive slowly varying function at $+\infty$ $(-\infty)$; (ii) the following second order regularity condition on the tails is satisfied

$$\Big|\,g(x+\triangle x) - g(x)\Big| = O\Big(|\,g(x)|\,\Big|\frac{\triangle x}{x}\Big|^{1/2}\Big), \tag{2.11}$$

when $\triangle x = o(|x|)$, as $x \to +\infty$ $(x \to -\infty)$.

Note that (2.11) holds true for g if $\Big|\frac{L(x+\triangle x)}{L(x)} - 1\Big| = O\Big(\Big|\frac{\triangle x}{x}\Big|^{1/2}\Big)$, as $x \to +\infty$ $(x \to -\infty)$, where L is the corresponding slowly varying function, and it is satisfied (even with degree 1 instead of 1/2) if L is continuously differentiable for sufficiently large $|x|$ and $|L'(x)| = O\left(\frac{L(x)}{|x|}\right)$, as $x \to +\infty$ $(x \to -\infty)$, which is valid for instance when L is some power of the logarithm.

Corollary 2.3 *Suppose that* $p_n \to 0$ $(p_n \to 1)$*, condition* $[A_1]$ *is satisfied,* $f \in SRV_\rho^{-\infty}$ $(f \in SRV_\rho^{+\infty})$*, where* $\rho = -(1+\gamma)$*,* $\gamma > 0$*, and* $g \in SRV_\rho^{-\infty}$ $(g \in SRV_\rho^{+\infty})$*, where* $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$*. Then the condition* (i) *in* (2.10) *is satisfied, and if additionally* $[A_2]$ *holds true, then the condition* (ii) *(cf.* (2.10)*) is also satisfied. Hence, both assertions stated in Theorems 2.3—2.4 are valid.*

We relegate the proof of the Corollary 2.3 to the section 5.

Our final corollary concerns the case when the *df* F and the function G are twice differentiable.

Let us define a function $v(u) = \frac{g}{f} \circ F^{-1}(u)$, $u \in (0,1)$.

Corollary 2.4 *Suppose that* $p_n \to 0$ $(p_n \to 1)$*, condition* $[A_1]$ *is satisfied, and assume that the functions* f*,* g *are differentiable on the set* $F^{-1}(U)$*. In the addition suppose that*

$$\sup_{u\in U}\left|\frac{\mathrm{v}'(u)\,[u\wedge(1-u)]}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)}\right| < \infty, \tag{2.12}$$

and that

$$\limsup_{u\downarrow 0\ (u\uparrow 1)}\left|\frac{\mathrm{v}\left(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)\right)}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)}\right| < \infty, \tag{2.13}$$

where $o(1)$ *denotes any function tending to zero when* $u \downarrow 0$ $(u \uparrow 1)$*.*

Then the condition (i) *in* (2.10) *is satisfied, and if additionally* $[A_2]$ *holds true, then the condition* (ii) *(cf.* (2.10)*) is also satisfied. Hence, both assertions stated in Theorems 2.3—2.4 are valid.*

Proof. The proof of the corollary 2.4 is straightforward. Take an arbitrary $C > 0$, fix $t : |t| < C$, and put $\alpha(n) = \sqrt{\frac{\log r_n}{r_n}}$ when we prove relation (i) of (2.10), and $\alpha(n) = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{r_n}}$ when we prove relation (ii) of (2.10) (under additional condition $[A_2]$). In both cases we have $\alpha(n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Consider $\left|v\left(p_n + t[p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n)\right) - v(p_n)\right|$. Since for all sufficiently large n p_n and $p_n + t[p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n)$ belong to the set U, the latter quantity is equal

$$|v(p_n)| \left| \frac{v'\left(p_n + \theta t[p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n)\right)}{v\left(p_n + \theta t[p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n)\right)} \, t\, [p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n) \right|$$

$$\times \left| \frac{v\left(p_n + \theta t[p_n \wedge (1-p_n)]\alpha(n)\right)}{v(p_n)} \right| = O\Big(\big|v(p_n)\big|\alpha(n)\Big), \qquad (2.14)$$

what yields (2.10). The corollary is proved. $\square$

The following examples show that the conditions (2.12) and (2.13) hold true in a number of interesting cases.

Example 2.1 *(Gumbel) Consider a distribution* $F(x) = \exp(-\exp(-x))$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, *and let* $g(x) = x^k$, *where* $k \in \mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$. *We take* k *integer only to avoid some problems of the existence for negative* x. *In this case we have* $f(x) = \exp(-x)\exp(-\exp(-x))$, *for the inverse function we have* $F^{-1}(u) = -\log(-\log u)$, $u \in (0,1)$. *In this case we obtain* $f(F^{-1}(u)) = -u \log u$, *and* $\mathrm{v}(u) = \frac{[-\log(-\log u)]^k}{-u \log u}$. *After simple computations we obtain*

$$\frac{\mathrm{v}'(u)\,[u \wedge (1-u)]}{\mathrm{v}(u)} = -k \frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{-\log(-\log u)\ u \log u} + \frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{-u \log u}(1 + \log u). \qquad (2.15)$$

If $u \to 0$, *the first term at the r.h.s in* (2.15) *tends to zero and the second term tends to* -1. *When* $u \to 1$ *we obtain that the first term is equivalent* $-k\frac{1-u}{-\log(-\log u)\,\log(1+(u-1)} \sim k\frac{1}{log(-\log u)} = o(1)$. *The second term is equivalent* $-\frac{1-u}{\log u} = \frac{u-1}{\log(1+(u-1))} = 1 * o(1)$. *Thus,* (2.12) *is satisfied in both cases* $U = [0, \varepsilon]$ $(p_n \to 0)$ *and* $U = [1-\varepsilon, 1]$ $(p_n \to 1)$. *The check* (2.13) *we write* $\frac{\mathrm{v}\left(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)\right)}{\mathrm{v}(u)} = \left[\frac{\log(-\log(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)))}{\log(-\log u)}\right]^k \frac{u}{u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)} \frac{\log u}{\log(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1))}$, *and arguing as before we obtain that the latter quantity is* $1 + o(1)$, *as* $u \to 0$ *and as* $u \to 1$ *as well.*

Example 2.2 *Let* $F(x) = (1 - \exp(-x^\gamma))\,\mathbb{I}(x \geq 0)$, $\gamma > 0$, *and let* $g(x) = x^\rho$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. *Now we get* $F^{-1}(u) = [-\log(1-u)]^{1/\gamma}$, $u \in (0,1)$, *and* $\mathrm{v}(u) = \frac{[-\log(1-u)]^{\rho/\gamma}}{\gamma[-\log(1-u)]^{(\gamma-1)/\gamma}(1-u)} = \frac{1}{\gamma}[-\log(1-u)]^{(\rho+1)/\gamma-1}\frac{1}{1-u}$. *Then we obtain*

$$\frac{\mathrm{v}'(u)\,[u \wedge (1-u)]}{\mathrm{v}(u)} = \frac{\rho + 1 - \gamma}{\gamma} \ \frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{-(1-u)\log(1-u)} + \frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{1-u}. \qquad (2.16)$$

The first term on the r.h.s in (2.16) *tends to the constant* $\frac{\rho+1-\gamma}{\gamma}$ *when* $u \to 0$ *and it tends to zero when* $u \to 1$, *the second term tends to zero, as* $u \to 0$ *and it tends to* 1, *as* $u \to 1$. *Thus,* (2.12) *is satisfied in both cases as in previous example. The check* (2.13) *we write* $\frac{\mathrm{v}\left(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)\right)}{\mathrm{v}(u)} = \left[\frac{\log(1-u-[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1))}{\log(1-u)}\right]^{\frac{\rho+1}{\gamma}-1} \frac{1-u}{1-u-[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)}$. *The simple computations show that both factors of the latter quantity tends to* 1, *as* $u \to 0$ *and as* $u \to 1$.

Example 2.3 *(Weibull) Let* $F(x) = \exp(-x^{-\gamma})\mathbb{I}(x \geq 0)$, $\gamma > 0$, *and let* $g(x) = x^{\rho}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. *Here we get* $F^{-1}(u) = [-\log u]^{-1/\gamma}$, $u \in (0,1)$, $f(F^{-1}(u)) = \gamma(-\log u)^{(\gamma+1)/\gamma}\, u$, *and* $\mathrm{v}\,(u) = \frac{[-\log u]^{-\rho/\gamma}}{\gamma[-\log u]^{(\gamma+1)/\gamma}\, u} = \frac{1}{\gamma}[-\log(1-u)]^{-(\rho+\gamma+1)/\gamma}\frac{1}{u}$. *Then we obtain*

$$\frac{\mathrm{v}'(u)\,[u \wedge (1-u)]}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)} = -\frac{\rho+\gamma+1}{\gamma}\;\frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{u\,\log u} - \frac{u \wedge (1-u)}{u}. \tag{2.17}$$

If $u \to 0$, *the first term on the r.h.s in* (2.17) *tends to zero and the second one tends to* -1, *and when* $u \to 1$, *the first term tends to the constant* $\frac{\rho+\gamma+1}{\gamma}$ *and the second one tends to zero. Thus,* (2.12) *is satisfied in both cases* $u \to 0$, $u \to 1$. *The check* (2.13) *we write* $\frac{\mathrm{v}\left(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)\right)}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)} = \left[\frac{\log u}{\log(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1))}\right]^{\frac{\rho+\gamma+1}{\gamma}} \frac{u}{u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)}$, *and simple evident arguments show that both factors here tends to* 1, *as* $u \to 0$ *and as* $u \to 1$.

Example 2.4 *Let* $C_{\gamma}\exp(-|x|^{\gamma})$, $\gamma > 0$, *where* C_{γ} *is a constant, depending only on* γ, *and let* $g(x) = \pm|x|^{\rho}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. *It is clear that the asymptotic behavior of the functions at the l.h.s.'s in conditions* (2.12) *and* (2.13) *are similar as in example 2.2 (*$u \to 1$*). So, these conditions are also satisfied.*

Example 2.5 *Here we consider an example of a distribution with super heavy tails, having no finite moments. In this case some difficulties arise, nevertheless the Bahadur – Kiefer representations* (2.4)*–*(2.7) *are still valid for the intermediate sample quantiles under some additional conditions.*

Let $F(x) = 1 - \frac{C}{\log x}$ *for* $x \geq x_0 > 0$, *where* $C > 0$ *is some constant. Suppose for ease of presentation that* $p_n \to 1$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *while* $r_n = n - k_n \to \infty$, *and let* $g(x) = x^{\rho}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, *though this will not influence the basic outline of our results.*

In this case $F^{-1}(u) = \exp\left(\frac{C}{1-u}\right)$, $f(F^{-1}(u)) = \frac{(1-u)^2}{C}\exp\left(-\frac{C}{1-u}\right)$, $\mathrm{v}\,(u) = \exp\left((\rho+1)\frac{C}{1-u}\right)\frac{C}{(1-u)^2}$. *Since* $p_n \to 1$, *we are interested only in the case* $u \to 1$, *so* $u \wedge (1-u) = 1-u$, *and after simple computations we obtain*

$$\frac{\mathrm{v}'(u)\,(1-u)}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)} = \frac{C(\rho+1)}{1-u} + 2, \tag{2.18}$$

what is not bounded as $u \to 1$, *and therefore* (2.12) *is clearly not satisfied. The computations of the magnitude on the l.h.s. in* (2.13) *yields*

$$\frac{\mathrm{v}\left(u+[u\wedge(1-u)]o(1)\right)}{\mathrm{v}\,(u)} = \exp\left(C(\rho+1)\frac{o(1)}{1-u}\right)(1+o(1))\,. \tag{2.19}$$

We conclude that (2.13) *is satisfied only if* $\frac{o(1)}{1-u} \to 0$, *as* $u \to 1$. *However, we apply our conditions for a sequence with* $u = p_n$ *(cf. proof of the Corollary 2.4). So,* $1-u = 1-p_n$, *the quantity* $o(1)$ *is* $\alpha(n) = \sqrt{\frac{\log r_n}{r_n}}$ *(cf.* (2.14)*), where* $r_n = k_n \wedge (n-k_n)$ *(and* $r_n = n - k_n$ *for all sufficiently large n,as* $p_n \to 1$*). Although the relations* (2.10) *are not valid more in our example, we can achieve a weaker relation* $\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C) = o\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\right)$, *guaranteeing that* (2.4) *and* (2.7) *are representations (cf. Remark 2.1). Observe that* (2.14) *(cf. the proof of Corollary 2.4) and* (2.18)*–*(2.19) *together imply that we need only* *that* $\frac{\alpha(n)}{1-p_n} = \sqrt{\frac{\log r_n}{r_n}}\ \frac{n}{r_n} = o(1)$, *as* $n \to \infty$*. Thus, the representations* (2.4) *and* (2.7) *are valid for the intermediate sample quantiles in this example if*

$$\frac{n^{2/3}(\log r_n)^{1/3}}{r_n} \to 0, \quad \textit{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Define a binomial r.v. $N_p = \sharp\{i\ : X_i \le \xi_p\}$, $0 < p < 1$. Our proof of Theorems 2.1-2.2 uses the following fact: conditionally on N_p the order statistics $X_{1:n}, \dots, X_{N_p:n}$ are distributed as order statistics corresponding to a sample of N_p i.i.d. r.v.'s with distribution function $F(x)/p$, $x \le \xi_p$. Though this fact is well known (cf., e.g., Theorem 12.4, [12], cf. also [8], [10]), we give a brief proof of it in the section 6.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We can assume with impunity that $a_2 \le 1/2$, i.e. we will prove representation (2.4) for the quantiles at the left edge of the variation series. Then $k_n \le (n - k_n)$ for all sufficiently large n, and so it is enough to prove (2.4) with

$$\Delta_n = A\, p_n^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4} \frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n}) + B\, p_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \Psi_{p_n, \frac{g}{f}}(C). \tag{3.1}$$

We begin with the proof of the first assertion of the theorem, where there is no restrictions on k_n in its tending to infinity.

Let $U_1, \dots, U_n$ denote a sample of independent uniform $(0,1)$ distributed r.v.'s, and $U_{1:n} \le \dots \le U_{n:n}$ – the corresponding order statistics. Put

$$N^x_{p_n} = \sharp\{i : X_i \le \xi_{p_n}\}, \quad N_{p_n} = \sharp\{i : U_i \le p_n\}, \tag{3.2}$$

and note that $\xi_{p_n n:n} = X_{k_n:n}$ (because $p_n = k_n/n$).

We must prove that $\boldsymbol{P}(|R_n(p_n)| > \Delta_n) = O\left(k_n^{-c}\right)$ for each $c > 0$ (cf. (2.4)), and since the joint distribution of $X_{k_n:n}$, $N^x_{p_n}$ coincide with joint distribution of $F^{-1}(U_{k_n:n})$, N_{p_n} it is suffices to verify it for a remainder given by

$$R_n(p_n) = G(F^{-1}(U_{k_n:n})) - G(F^{-1}(p_n)) + \frac{N_{p_n} - p_n n}{n} \frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n}).$$

Since $\boldsymbol{P}(U_{k_n:n} \notin U) = O(exp(-\delta n))$ for some $\delta > 0$ not depending on n, we can rewrite $R_n(p_n)$ for all sufficiently large n as

$$\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\, R_{n,1} + R_{n,2}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $R_{n,1} = U_{k_n:n} - p_n + \frac{N_{p_n} - p_n n}{n}$, and $R_{n,2} = \Big(\frac{g}{f}\left(F^{-1}(p_n + \theta(U_{k_n:n} - p_n))\right)$ $-\frac{g}{f}\left(F^{-1}(p_n)\right)\Big)\big(U_{k_n:n} - p_n\big)$, $0 < \theta < 1$. Fix an arbitrary $c > 0$ and note that we can estimate $R_{n,j}$, $j = 1, 2$, on the set $E = \big\{\omega : |N_{p_n} - p_n n| < A_0\big(p_n\, n \log k_n\big)^{1/2}\big\}$, where A_0 is a positive constant, depending only on c, because by Bernstein inequality $\boldsymbol{P}(\Omega \setminus E) = O(k_n^{-c})$ (in fact we can take every A_0: $A_0^2 > 2c$). We will prove that

$$\boldsymbol{P}\big(|R_{n,1}| > A_1(\,p_n\,)^{1/4}(\log k_n/n)^{3/4}\big) = O(k_n^{-c}) \tag{3.4}$$

and that

$$\boldsymbol{P}\big(|R_{n,2}| > A_2\, p_n\, \Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C)(\log k_n/k_n)^{1/2}\big) = O(k_n^{-c}). \tag{3.5}$$

Here and elsewhere $A_i\,, i = 1, 2, \ldots$, and C denote some positive constants, depending only on c. Relations (3.3)–(3.5) imply (2.4) with Δ_n given in (3.1).

First we prove (3.4), using a similar conditioning on N_{p_n} argument as in proof of lemmas 4.1, 4.3 in [8]. First let $k_n \le N_{p_n}$, then conditionally on N_{p_n} the order statistic $U_{k_n:n}$ is distributed as k_n-th order statistic $U'_{k_n:N_{p_n}}$ of the sample $U'_1, \ldots, U'_{N_{p_n}}$ independent $(0, p_n)$ uniformly distributed r.v.'s (cf. lemma 6.1, appendix). Its expectation $\boldsymbol{E}\big(U_{k_n:n} \,|\, N_{p_n},\ k_n \le N_{p_n}\big) = p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1}$, and the conditional variance $V_{k_n}^2 = \frac{p_n^2}{N_{p_n}+2} \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1}\big(1 - \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1}\big)$, and on the set E we have an estimate $V_{k_n}^2 \le A_0 (p_n)^{1/2}\, n^{-3/2} \log^{1/2} n$. Then rewrite $R_{n,1}$ (at the event $k_n \le N_{p_n}$) as

$$U_{k_n:n} - p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n} + 1} + R'_{n,1}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $R'_{n,1} = p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} - p_n + \frac{N_{p_n} - p_n n}{n} = \frac{(N_{p_n} - k_n)^2}{n(N_{p_n}+1)} + \frac{N_{p_n} - k_n}{n(N_{p_n}+1)} - \frac{k_n}{n(N_{p_n}+1)}$, and on the set E the latter quantity is of the order $O\left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)$, and since $\frac{\log k_n}{n} = o\big(p_n^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\big)$, the remainder term $R'_{n,1}$ is of negligible order for our purposes. For the first two terms in (3.6) we have

$$\boldsymbol{P}\left(\left|U_{k_n:n} - p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n} + 1}\right| > A_1 (p_n)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4} \big|N_{p_n} :\ k_n \le N_{p_n}\right)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{P}\left(\left|U'_{k_n:N_{p_n}} - p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n} + 1}\right| > A_1 (p_n)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\right) = P_1 + P_2, \tag{3.7}$$

where N_{p_n} is fixed, $k_n \le N_{p_n}$, A_1 is a constant which we will choose later, $P_1 = \boldsymbol{P}\left(U'_{k_n:N_{p_n}} > p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} + A_1 (p_n)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\right)$, $P_2 = \boldsymbol{P}\left(U'_{k_n:N_{p_n}} < p_n \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} - A_1 (p_n)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{3/4}\right)$. We evaluate P_1, the treatment for P_2 is similar. Consider a binomial r.v. $S'_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{p_n}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{U'_{i:N_{p_n}}} \le \mathbf{p_n} \frac{\mathbf{k_n}}{\mathbf{N_{p_n}+1}} + \mathbf{A_1 (p_n)^{1/4}} (\frac{\log \mathbf{k_n}}{\mathbf{n}})^{\mathbf{3/4}}\}}$ with parameter (q_n, N_{p_n}), where $q_n = \min\big(1, \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} + t_n\big)$, where $t_n = A_1 \left(\frac{\log k_n}{k_n}\right)^{3/4}$. If $q_n = 1$, then $P_1 = 0$ and the inequality we need is valid trivial. Let $q_n < 1$ and let $\overline{S'}_n$ denote the average S'_n/N_{p_n}, then the probability P_1 is equal to

$$\boldsymbol{P}(S'_n < k_n) = \boldsymbol{P}\left(\overline{S'}_n - q_n < \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}} - \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n} + 1} - t_n\right). \tag{3.8}$$

Note that $\frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}} - \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} = \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}(N_{p_n}+1)} < \frac{1}{N_{p_n}}$, and since the latter quantity is $o\left(t_n k_n^{-1/4}\right) = o(t_n)$ on the set E, this term can be omitted at the r.h.s. of (3.8) in our estimating. To evaluate $\boldsymbol{P}\left(\overline{S'}_n - q_n < -t_n\right)$ we note that $q_n - t_n = \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} \in (0, 1)$, and that $q_n > 1/2$ for all sufficiently large n (and hence k_n and N_{p_n}) on the set E. So, we may apply an inequality (2.2) of Hoeffding [11] with $\mu = q_n$ and with $g(\mu) = 1/(2\mu(1-\mu))$. Then we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{P}(S'_n < k_n) \le \exp\left(-N_{p_n} t_n^2 g(q_n)\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{N_{p_n} A_1^2 \left(\log k_n/k_n\right)^{3/2}}{2q_n(1-q_n)}\right). \tag{3.9}$$

Finally we note that $1 - q_n = 1 - \frac{k_n}{N_{p_n}+1} - A_1 \left(\frac{\log k_n}{k_n}\right)^{3/4} \le \frac{N_{p_n}+1-k_n}{N_{p_n}+1}$, and on the set E the latter quantity is not greater than $\frac{A_0(k_n \log k_n)^{1/2}}{N_{p_n}}$. Then we can get a low bound for the ratio at the r.h.s. in (3.9): $\frac{N_{p_n} A_1^2 \left(\log k_n/k_n\right)^{3/2}}{2q_n(1-q_n)} \ge \frac{A_1^2 N_{p_n}^2 \left(\log k_n/k_n\right)^{3/2}}{2A_0(k_n \log k_n)^{1/2}} = \frac{A_1^2}{2A_0} \log k_n \left(\frac{N_{p_n}}{k_n}\right)^2 = \frac{A_1^2}{2A_0} \log k_n \,(1 + o(1))$. This bound and (3.9) together yield that when $\frac{A_1^2}{2A_0} \ge c$ the desired relation $P_1 = O(k_n^{-c})$ hold true. The same estimate is valid for P_2.

Note that the condition $\frac{A_1^2}{2A_0} \ge c$ which we needed to establish the desired estimates can be weakened to $\frac{A_1^2}{2A_0} \ge c - 1/2 > 0$ if we apply a refinement of Heoffding's inequality due to Talagrand [20] (cf. also Leon and Perron [16]). However the improvement is not very useful here, as applying Talagrand's inequality instead of Hoeffding,s only affects the constant, but not the order bound in our setting.

In case $N_{p_n} < k_n$ we use the fact that $U_{k_n:n}$ conditionally on N_{p_n} is distributed as $(k_n - N_{p_n})$-th order statistic $U''_{k_n - N_{p_n}:n - N_{p_n}}$ of the sample $U''_1, \ldots, U''_{n-N_{p_n}}$ from $(1-p_n, 1)$ uniform distribution, its expectation is $p_n + \frac{k_n - N_{p_n}}{n - N_{p_n}+1}$, and for the conditional variance we have the estimate $V^2_{k_n - N_{p_n}} \le A_0(p_n \log k_n\,)^{1/2}\, n^{-3/2}$. In this case we use a representation for $R_{n,1} = R''_{n,1} + R''_{n,2}$, where $R''_{n,1} = U_{k_n:n} - p_n - \frac{k_n - N_{p_n}}{n - N_{p_n}+1}(1 - p_n)$, and $R''_{n,2} = \frac{N_{p_n} - p_n\, n}{n} + \frac{k_n - N_{p_n}}{n - N_{p_n}+1}(1 - p_n)$. Similarly as in first case we obtain that $R''_{n,2} = O\big(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\big)$ with probability $1 - O(k_n^{-c})$, and this term is of the negligible order in our estimating. Using Hoeffding's inequality we obtain for $R''_{n,1}$ same estimate as for $R'_{n,1}$. So (3.4) is proved.

It remains to prove (3.5). First note that by (3.4) on the set E with probability $1 - O(k_n^{-c})$ we have $|U_{k_n:n} - p_n| \le A_0 \frac{(k_n \log k_n)^{1/2}}{n} + A_1 p_n \left(\frac{\log k_n}{k_n}\right)^{3/4} = \big(p_n \frac{\log k_n}{n}\big)^{1/2}\big(1 + o(1)\big)$. Thus, there exists A_2, depending only on c, such that $|R_{n,2}| \le A_2 \big(p_n \frac{\log k_n}{n}\big)^{1/2} \Psi_{p_n, \frac{g}{f}}(A_2)$ with probability $1 - O(k_n^{-c})$. This implies (3.5). Thus, the first assertion of the theorem 2.1 is proved.

To prove the second assertion, it is sufficient to repeat previous arguments replacing $\log k_n$ by $\log n$ throughout the proof, and applying the fact $\log n/k_n \to 0$ (due to $[A_2]$) instead of the evident fact that $\log k_n/k_n \to 0$ used before, moreover now we should use the function $\widehat{\Psi}_{p_n,h}(C)$ instead of $\Psi_{p_n,h}(C)$. These replacements lead to estimates with probability $O(n^{-c})$ for each $c > 0$. The theorem is proved. $\square$

4 Proof of theorem 2.2

We give a detailed proof of the first assertion of Theorem 2.2. To prove the second one it is enough to make similar replacements as in the proof of the corresponding part of the Theorem 2.1, therefore we omit it.

Let $N^x_{p_n}$ and N_{p_n} are given as in (3.2), then we can rewrite integral on the l.h.s. of (2.7) as $\frac{sgn(N^x_{p_n}-k_n)}{n}\sum_{i=(k_n\wedge N^x_{p_n})+1}^{k_n\vee N^x_{p_n}}(G(X_{i:n})-G(\xi_{p_n}))$, where $sgn(x)=x/|x|$, $sgn(0)=0$. Let us adopt the following notation: for any integer k and m define a set $I_{(k,m)}:=\{i:(k\wedge m)+1\le i\le k\vee m\}$ and let $\sum_{i\in I_{(k,m)}}(.)_i := sgn(m-k)\sum_{i=(k\wedge m)+1}^{k\vee m}(.)_i$. Then we must estimate $R_n(p_n)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in I_{(k_n,N^x_{p_n})}}(G(X_{i:n})-G(\xi_{p_n}))+\frac{\left(N^x_{p_n}-p_n n\right)^2}{2n^2}\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$ (cf. (2.7)), and similarly as in proof of Theorem 2.1 we note that $R_n(p_n)$ is distributed as

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in I_{(k_n,N_{p_n})}}\Big(G\circ F^{-1}(U_{i:n})-G\circ F^{-1}(p_n)\Big)+\frac{\left(N_{p_n}-p_n n\right)^2}{2n^2}\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n})$$

$$=\frac{g}{f}(\xi_{p_n})R_{n,1}+R_{n,2}, \tag{4.1}$$

where
$R_{n,1}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in I_{(k_n,N_{p_n})}}(U_{i:n}-p_n)+\frac{\left(N_{p_n}-p_n n\right)^2}{2n^2}$,
$R_{n,2}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in I_{(k_n,N_{p_n})}}\left[\frac{g}{f}\circ F^{-1}\big(p_n+\theta_i(U_{i:n}-p_n)\big)-\frac{g}{f}\circ F^{-1}\big(p_n\big)\right]\Big(U_{i:n}-p_n\Big)$,
$0<\theta_i<1, \quad i\in I_{(k_n,N_{p_n})}$.

As well as before (cf. the proof of Theorem 2.1) we can assume with impunity that $a_2\le 1/2$, then we need to prove (2.7) with

$$\Delta_n=A\,p_n^{3/4}\left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})+B\,p_n\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(C), \tag{4.2}$$

Fix an arbitrary $c>0$ and prove that

$$\boldsymbol{P}\Big(|R_{n,1}|>A_1(\,p_n\,)^{3/4}(\log k_n/n)^{5/4}\Big)=O(k_n^{-c}), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\boldsymbol{P}\Big(|R_{n,2}|>A_2\,p_n\,\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Psi_{p_n,\frac{g}{f}}(A_2)\Big)=O(k_n^{-c}), \tag{4.4}$$

where $A_i>0$, $i=1,2,\ldots$, are some constants, depending only on c. Relations (4.1) and (4.3)–(4.4) imply (2.7) with Δ_n as in (4.2). Similarly as when proving of Theorem 2.1 it is enough to estimate $R_{n,j}$, $j=1,2$, on the set $E=\big\{\omega:|N_{p_n}-p_n n|<A_0\big(p_n\,n\,\log k_n\big)^{1/2}\big\}$, where $A_0>0$ is a constant, depending only on c, such that $\boldsymbol{P}(\Omega\setminus E)=O(k_n^{-c})$.

First we treat $R_{n,2}$. Note that

$$\max_{i\in I_{(k_n,N_{p_n})}}\big|\,U_{i:n}-p_n\big|=\big|\,U_{k_n:n}-p_n\big|\vee\big|\,U_{N_{p_n}:n}-p_n\big|\vee\big|\,U_{N_{p_n}+1:n}-p_n\big|\,,$$

$\boldsymbol{P}\Big(\big|\,U_{k_n:n}-p_n\big|>A_0\big(p_n\log k_n/n\,\big)^{1/2}\Big)=O(k_n^{-c})$ (cf. proof of Theorem 2.1), and for $j=N_{p_n:n}\,,N_{p_n:n}{+}1$ simultaneously we have $\boldsymbol{P}\Big(\big|\,U_{j:n}{-}p_n\big|>A_1\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Big)\le\boldsymbol{P}\Big(U_{N_{p_n}+1:n}-U_{N_{p_n}:n}>A_1\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Big)=\boldsymbol{P}\Big(U_{1:n}>A_1\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Big)=\Big(1{-}A_1\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Big)^n=O(k_n^{-c})$ for $A_1>c$. Since $\frac{\log k_n}{n}=o(\frac{p_n\log k_n}{n})^{1/2}$, on the set E we obtain

$$\big|R_{n,2}\big|\le\frac{1}{n}\Psi_{p_n\frac{g}{f}}(A_0)A_0^2\Big(p_n\,n\log k_n\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\frac{p_n\;\log k_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2}=A_2p_n\frac{\log k_n}{n}\Psi_{p_n\frac{g}{f}}(A_0)$$

with probability $1 - O(k_n^{-c})$, and (4.4) is proved.

Finally, consider $R_{n,1}$. Note that conditionally on $N_{p_n},\ k_n < N_{p_n}$, the order statistics $U_{i:n},\ k_n \le i \le N_{p_n}$, are distributed as the order statistics $U'_{i:N_{p_n}}$ from the uniform $(0, p_n)$ distribution (cf. proof of theorem 2.1), their conditional expectations are equal to $p_n \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1}$. Then in the case $k_n < N_{p_n}$ (the proof for the case $N_{p_n} \ge k_n$ is similar (cf. proof of theorem 2.1) with respect to interval $(1 - p_n, 1)$, and we omit the details) we rewrite $R_{n,1}$ as

$$R_{n,1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{N_{p_n}} \big(U_{i:n} - p_n \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1}\big) + R'_{n,1}\,, \tag{4.5}$$

where $R'_{n,1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{N_{p_n}} p_n \big(\frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1} - 1\big) + \frac{(N_{p_n} - p_n\, n)^2}{2n^2} = -\frac{k_n}{n^2} \frac{(N_{p_n} - k_n)(N_{p_n} - k_n - 1)}{2\,(N_{p_n}+1)} + \frac{(N_{p_n} - k_n)^2}{2n^2} = \frac{(N_{p_n} - k_n)^2 (N_{p_n} + 1 - k_n)}{2\,(N_{p_n}+1) n^2} - \frac{k_n (N_{p_n} - k_n)}{2(N_{p_n}+1) n^2}$, and on the set E the latter quantity is of the order $O\left(\frac{k_n^{1/2} (\log k_n)^{3/2}}{n^2}\right) = o\left(\big(p_n\big)^{3/4} \left(\frac{\log k_n}{n}\right)^{5/4}\right)$, i.e. $R'_{n,1}$ is of negligible order (cf. (4.3)) for our purposes.

It remains to evaluate the dominant first term on the r.h.s. in (4.5). Fix an arbitrary $c_1 > c + 1/2$, and note that conditional on N_{p_n} the variance of $U_{i:n}$ $(k_n + 1 \le i \le N_{p_n})$ is equal to $V_i^2 = \big(p_n\big)^2 \frac{1}{N_{p_n}+2} \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1}\right)$, and on the set E it is less than $\big(p_n\big)^2 \frac{A_0 k_n^{1/2} (\log k_n)^{1/2}}{N_{p_n}^2}$, and $V_i \le p_n A_0^{1/2} k_n^{1/4} (\log k_n)^{1/4} / N_{p_n} \le A_0^{1/2} p_n k_n^{-3/4} (\log k_n)^{1/4} \le A_0^{1/2} \big(p_n\big)^{1/4} n^{-3/4} (\log k_n)^{1/4}$. Using Hoeffding's inequality (similarly as in proof of theorem 2.1), we find that

$$\boldsymbol{P}\Big(\big|U_{i:n} - p_n \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1}\big| > A_1 \big(p_n\big)^{1/4} \big(\log k_n / n\big)^{3/4} \Big| N_{p_n} :\ k_n \le N_{p_n}\Big) = O(k_n^{-c})\,,$$

where A_1 depends only on c_1 (in fact it is true for every A_1 such that $A_1^2 > 2A_0 c$). Thus

$$\boldsymbol{P}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\big| \sum_{i=k_n}^{N_{p_n}} \big(U_{i:n} - p_n \frac{i}{N_{p_n}+1}\big)\big| > A_0 A_1 \big(p_n\big)^{3/4} \big(\log k_n / n\big)^{5/4} \Big| N_{p_n} :\ k_n \le N_{p_n}\Big)$$

$$\le A_0 (k_n \log k_n)^{1/2}\, O(k_n^{-c_1}) = O(k_n^{-c})\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Combining (4.5)–(4.6) and similar estimates for the case $N_{p_n} < k_n$, arrive at (4.3). The theorem is proved. □

5 Proof of Corollary 2.3

Suppose for definiteness that $p_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, then we must prove the relations:

$$\Psi_{p_n, \frac{g}{f}}(C) = O\left(\Big(\frac{\log k_n}{k_n}\Big)^{1/4} \frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\right); \quad \widehat{\Psi}_{p_n, \frac{g}{f}}(C) = O\left(\Big(\frac{\log n}{k_n}\Big)^{1/4} \frac{|g|}{f}(\xi_{p_n})\right). \tag{5.1}$$

Let $\log(\cdot)$ denote $\log k_n$ when we prove a first of relations (5.1) and $\log n$ when we prove the second one. Since we will need only that $\log(\cdot)/k_n \to 0$, what is evident in the first case and is valid by $[A_2]$ in the second one, this notation will allow us to prove each of desired assertions simultaneously.

Define $x_n = F^{-1}(p_n)$, which tend to $-\infty$, as $n \to \infty$. Fix $C > 0$ and for a fixed $t: \ |t| \leq C$, put $\triangle x_n = F^{-1}\left(p_n + t\sqrt{p_n \frac{\log(\cdot)}{n}}\right) - x_n = F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1 + t\sqrt{\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}}\right)\right) - x_n$.

First we prove that $\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n} \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Due to smoothness condition $[A_1]$ for all sufficiently large n we may write $\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n} = \frac{1}{x_n\, f\left(F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1+\theta\, t\sqrt{\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}}\right)\right)\right)} t\, \sqrt{p_n \frac{\log(\cdot)}{n}} = \frac{1}{x_n f(x_n)} \frac{f(F^{-1}(p_n))}{f\left(F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1+\theta\, t\sqrt{\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}}\right)\right)\right)} t\, \sqrt{p_n \frac{\log(\cdot)}{n}}$, where $0 < \theta < 1$, and since due to regularity condition we have $f(x_n)x_n \sim -\gamma\, F(x_n) = -\gamma\, p_n$, as $x_n \to -\infty$ (cf., e.g., Bingham et al. [2]), the latter quantity is equivalent to $-\frac{1}{\gamma\, p_n} \frac{f(F^{-1}(p_n))}{f\left(F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1+o(1)\right)\right)\right)} t\, \sqrt{p_n \frac{\log(\cdot)}{n}} = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{f(F^{-1}(p_n))}{f\left(F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1+o(1)\right)\right)\right)} t\, \sqrt{\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}}$. It remains to show that $\frac{f(F^{-1}(p_n))}{f\left(F^{-1}\left(p_n\left(1+o(1)\right)\right)\right)} = 1 + o(1)$. Since $f \in SRV^{-\infty}_{-(1+\gamma)}$, for all $x < x_0 < 0$ we have $f(x) = |x|^{-(1+\gamma)}L(x)$, where $L(x)$ is a slowly varying in $-\infty$ positive function. Moreover, the inverse function $F^{-1}(u)$ is regular varying at zero, i.e. $F^{-1}(u) = u^{-1/\gamma}L_1(u)$, where $L_1(u)$ is a correspondent slowly varying at zero function. So, for sufficiently large n we have $\frac{f(F^{-1}(p_n))}{f\left(p_n\left(1+o(1)\right)\right)} = \frac{\left[p_n^{-1/\gamma}L_1(p_n)\right]^{-(1+\gamma)} L(F^{-1}(p_n))}{\left[\left(p_n(1+o(1))\right)^{-1/\gamma} L_1(p_n(1+o(1)))\right]^{-(1+\gamma)} L(F^{-1}(p_n(1+o(1))))} \sim \frac{L(F^{-1}(p_n))}{L(F^{-1}(p_n(1+o(1))))} = \frac{L\left[p_n^{-1/\gamma}L_1(p_n)\right]}{L\left[\left(p_n(1+o(1))\right)^{-1/\gamma} L_1(p_n(1+o(1)))\right]} \sim 1$. Thus, $\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}}\right)$.

Finally, we obtain a bound for $\left|\frac{g}{f}\big(x_n + \triangle x_n\big) - \frac{g}{f}\big(x_n\big)\right|$ for an arbitrary fixed $C > 0$ and $|t| \leq C$, as $n \to \infty$. Due to relation (2.11) which holds true for the density f as well as for the function g we have

$$\left|\frac{g}{f}\big(x_n + \triangle x_n\big) - \frac{g}{f}\big(x_n\big)\right| = \left|\frac{f(x_n)[g(x_n + \triangle x_n) - g(x_n)] - g(x_n)[f(x_n + \triangle x_n) - f(x_n)]}{f(x_n + \triangle x_n)f(x_n)}\right|$$

$$= O\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(x_n)\frac{f(x_n)}{f(x_n + \triangle x_n)}\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right|^{1/2}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(x_n)\frac{f(x_n)}{f(x_n) + [f(x_n + \triangle x_n) - f(x_n)]}\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right|^{1/2}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(x_n)\frac{1}{1 + O\left(\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right|^{1/2}\right)}\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right|^{1/2}\right) = O\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(x_n)\left|\frac{\triangle x_n}{x_n}\right|^{1/2}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{|g|}{f}(x_n)\left(\frac{\log(\cdot)}{k_n}\right)^{1/4}\right),$$

as $n \to \infty$.. The latter bound yields (5.1). The corollary is proved. $\square$

6 Appendix

Let as before, $N_p = \sharp\{i\ :\ X_i \le \xi_p,\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$, where $0 < p < 1$ is fixed. In this appendix we prove that conditionally on N_p the order statistics $X_{1:n}, \ldots, X_{N_p:n}$ are distributed as order statistics corresponding a sample of N_p i.i.d. r.v.'s with distribution function $F(x)/p$, $x \le \xi_p$. Though this fact is essentially known (cf.,e.g., Theorem 12.4, [12], cf. also [8], [10]), we add a brief proof of it. Let $U_1, \ldots, U_n$ be independent r.v.'s uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$ and let $U_{1:n}, \ldots, U_{n:n}$ denote the corresponding order statistics. Put $N_{p,u} = \sharp\{i\ :\ U_i \le p,\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Since the joint distribution of the pair $X_{i:n}$, N_p is same as joint distribution of $F^{-1}(U_{i:n})$, $N_{p,u}$, it is enough to prove the assertion for the uniform distribution.

Lemma 6.1 *Conditionally given $N_{p,u}$, the order statistics $U_{1,n}, \ldots, U_{N_{p,u},n}$ are distributed as order statistics corresponding to a sample of $N_{p,u}$ independent $(0, p)$-uniform distributed r.v.'s.*

Proof. *a*). First consider the case $N_{p,u} = n$. Take arbitrary $0 < u_1 \le \cdots \le u_n < p$ and write

$$P(U_{1:n} \le u_1, \ldots, U_{N_{p,u}:n} \le u_n \mid N_{p,u} = n) = \frac{P(U_{1:n} \le u_1, \ldots, U_{n:n} \le u_n)}{p^n}$$
$$= \frac{n!}{p^n} \int_0^{u_1} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \cdots \int_{u_{n-1}}^{u_n} d\,x_1 d\,x_2 \ldots d\,x_n,$$

and the latter is $d.f.$ of the order statistics corresponding to the sample of n independent $(0, p)$-uniform distributed r.v.'s. *b*). Consider the case $N_{p,u} = k < n$. Let $F_{i,n}(u) = P(U_{i:n} \le u)$ be a *df* of i-th order statistic, put $P_n(k) = P(N_{p,u} = k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$. Then we have

$$P(U_{1:n} \le u_1, \ldots, U_{N_{p,u}:n} \le u_k \mid N_{p,u} = k) = \frac{P(U_{1:n} \le u_1, \ldots, U_{k:n} \le u_k, U_{k+1:n} > p)}{P_n(k)}. \tag{6.1}$$

The probability in the nominator on the r.h.s. of (6.1) is equal to

$$\int_p^1 P\big(U_{1:n} \le u_1, \ldots, U_{k:n} \le u_k \mid U_{k+1:n} = v\big)\, dF_{k+1,n}(v),$$

and by the Markov property of order statistics the latter quantity equals

$$\int_p^1 \left(\frac{k!}{v^k} \int_0^{u_1} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \cdots \int_{u_{k-1}}^{u_k} d\,x_1 d\,x_2 \ldots d\,x_k \right) dF_{k+1,n}(v)$$
$$= \frac{k!}{p^k} \left(\int_0^{u_1} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \cdots \int_{u_{k-1}}^{u_k} d\,x_1 d\,x_2 \ldots d\,x_k \right) \times p^k \int_p^1 \frac{1}{v^k}\, dF_{k+1,n}(v),$$

and since $p^k \int_p^1 \frac{1}{v^k}\, dF_{k+1,n}(v) = p^k \int_p^1 \frac{(1-v)^{n-k-1}}{B(k+1,n-k)}\, dv = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} = P_n(k)$, where $B(k+1, n-k) = k!(n-k-1)!/n!$, we obtain that conditional probability in (6.1) is equal

$$\frac{k!}{p^k} \int_0^{u_1} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \cdots \int_{u_{k-1}}^{u_k} d\,x_1 d\,x_2 \ldots d\,x_k,$$

which corresponds to the $(0, p)$-uniform distribution. The lemma is proved. $\square$

References

[1] Bahadur, R.R.(1966). A note on quantiles in large samples., *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37** 577–580.

[2] Bingham, N.M., Goldie, C.M. and Teugels, J.L. (1987)., *Regular variation*, Cambridge Univ. Press (Encyclopedia Math. Appl.) **27**, Cambridge.

[3] Chanda, K.C.(1992). Bahadur–Kiefer representation properties of intermediate order statistics., *Statist. & Prob.Lett./Amsterdam: North-Holland* **14** 175–178.

[4] Deheuvels, P. (2000). Strong approximation of quantile processes by iterated Kiefer processes., *Ann. Probab.* **28** 909–945.

[5] Deheuvels, P. (2009) A multivariate Bahadur – Kiefer representation for the empirical copula process.,*Zap. Nauchn. Sem. POMI* **364** 120–147, POMI, SPb, ; Transl. in *J. Math.Sci.* (N.Y.) (2010). **163**:4, 382-398.

[6] Deheuvels, P. and Mason, D.M. (1990). Bahadur – Kiefer – type processes., *Ann. Probab.* **18** 669–697.

[7] Gribkova, N.V. and Helmers, R. (2006). The empirical Edgeworth expansion for a Studentized trimmed mean., *Math. Methods Statist.* **15** 61–87; Report PNA-R0214.

[8] Gribkova, N.V. and Helmers, R. (2007). On the Edgeworth expansion and the M out of N bootstrap accuracy for a Studentized trimmed mean., *Math. Methods Statist.* **16** 142–176.

[9] Gribkova, N.V. and Helmers, R. (2011). Second order approximations for slightly trimmed sums., *Theory Probab. Appl.* **56**, no. 4, (`to appear`); arXiv:1104.3347v1 [math.PR], 17 Apr 2011.

[10] Hall, P. and Padmanabhan, A.R. (1992). On the bootstrap and the trimmed mean. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **41** 132–153.

[11] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probabilities inequalities for sum of bounded random variables., *Amer.Stat.Assoc.J.* **58** 13-30.

[12] Kallenberg, O. (2002)., *Foundations of Modern Probability*, Springer, New York.

[13] Kiefer, J.C. (1967). On Bahadur's representation of sample quantiles., *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38** 1323–1342.

[14] Kiefer, J.C. (1970). Deviations between the sample quantile process and the sample *df*. In: *Nonparametric Techniques in Statistical Inference* (M. Puri, ed.), 299–319, London, Cambridge Univ. Press.

[15] Kiefer, J.C. (1970). Old and new methods for study order statistics and sample quantile. In:*Nonparametric Techniques in Statistical Inference* (M. Puri, ed.), 349–357, London, Cambridge Univ. Press.

[16] Leon, C.A. and Perron, F. (2003). Extremal properties of sums of Bernulli random variables., *Statist. & Prob.Lett.* **62** 345–354.

[17] Reiss, R.-D. (1989)., *Approximate distributions of order statistics with applications to nonparametric statistics*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[18] Sen, P.K. (1968). Asymptotic normality of sample quantiles for m-dependent processes., *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39** 1724–1730.

[19] Shorack, G.R. and Wellner, J.A. (1986)., *Empirical processes with application in statistics*, Wiley, New York.

[20] Talagrand, M. (1995). The missing factor in Hoeffding's inequalities., *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare* **31** 689–702.

[21] Wu, W.B. (2005). On the Bahadur representation of sample quantiles for dependent sequences., *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1934–1963.